

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/817,704	08/25/1997	ANTHONIUS J. SWAAK	P8214-7002	8580
7590 01/25/2002 ARENT FOX KINTER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 600				D.U.D.
			EXAMINER	
			, EWOLDT, GERALD R	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-5339			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	30

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.

Applicant(s)

08/817,704

Office Action Summary Examiner

G. R. Ewoldt

Art Unit 1644

Swaak



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
Period f	for Reply			
THE N	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
aft	ter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic	CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed cation. s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will		
be	considered timely.	period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this		
co - Failur - Any r	ommunication. re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by	y statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). e mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any		
Status				
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 19, 2001			
2a) 💢	This action is FINAL . 2b) This act	tion is non-final.		
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is earte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>18, 20, 23-26, and 31</u>	is/are pending in the application.		
4	la) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.		
6) 💢	Claim(s) 18, 20, 23-26, and 31	is/are rejected.		
7) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.		
8) 🗌	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Applica	ntion Papers			
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e objected to by the Examiner.		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved.		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
13) 🗌	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).		
a) 🗆	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:			
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received.		
,	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been received in Application No		
	 Copies of the certified copies of the priority d application from the International Bure ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th 	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic			
·		, priority dried: de diete. de 1.10(0).		
Attachm				
	otice of References Cited (PTC-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC-948)	18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).		
	Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19)			
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	iomation Discussife Statement(s) (1 10-1445) Taper Nots).	ZO) Other.		

Serial No.: 08/817,704 2

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The examiner of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Dr. Gerald R. Ewoldt, Group Art Unit 1644.
- 2. Claims 18, 20, 23-26, and 31 are currently pending in this application.
- 3. In view of Applicant's amendment and response, filed 10/19/01, only the following rejections remain.
- 4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 20, 25, 26, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, for the reasons of record as set forth in Paper No. 27, mailed 5/21/01. This is a new matter rejection.

Applicant arguments, filed 10/19/01, have been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that the recitations of a period of "3 to 6 weeks" would overcome the rejection. However, due to the recitation of a period which "comprises", the time frame encompassed by the claims remains open-ended and is not supported by the specification as filed.

Serial No.: 08/817,704 The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action: A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

Art Unit: 1644

States.

6.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18, 20 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Toshihide et al. (of record).

Applicant arguments, filed 10/19/01, have been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that "It appears that Toshihide is directed to a method of accomplishing autologous blood donation and orthopedic replacement surgery and not to a method for treating symptoms or disease activity." However, the reference teaches the steps (administering EPO to RA patients) and the time limitations (3 weeks) of the claims; thus the reference teaches the claimed Applicant's further characterization of the claimed method. method (treating a symptom or ameliorating a disease activity) comprises only further characterization of a known method and lends no patentable weight to the claims.

Claims 18, 20, 23-26, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Pettersson et al. (of record).

Applicant arguments, filed 10/19/01, have been fully considered but are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that "we believe that Pettersson et al. clearly does not teach or suggest treating such symptoms as morning stiffness pain, loss of strength, painful joints and swollen joints (or of ameliorating a disease activity of erythrocyte sedimentation rate or C-reactive protein level, as in the presently claimed invention." However, the reference teaches the steps (administering EPO to RA

Serial No.: 08/817,704 4
Art Unit: 1644

patients) and the time limitations (24 weeks which would "comprise" 3 to 6, or 6 weeks) of the claims; thus the reference teaches the claimed method. Applicant's further characterization of the claimed method comprises only further characterization of a known method and lends no patentable weight to the claims.,

- 10. The following are New Grounds for Rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.
- 11. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

12. Claim 18, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as the specification does not contain a written description of the claimed invention, in that the disclosure does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. This is a new matter rejection.

The specification and the claims as originally filed do not provide support for the invention as now claimed, specifically, a method of treating "morning stiffness pain."

Applicant's amendment, filed 10/19/01, asserts that no new matter has been added. However, no support for the new limitation has been found as indicated in the amendment. Note that the specification does provide support for "morning stiffness," but it does not provide support for "morning stiffness pain."

- 13. No claim is allowed.
- 14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of

Serial No.: 08/817,704

date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1644

the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Gerald Ewoldt whose telephone number is (703) 308-9805. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center telephone number is (703) 305-3014.

G.R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
January 22, 2002

fate / Ne Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 1600